



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Gloria Molina
Yvonne Burke
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor

2006

PUBLIC MEMBERS

First District

George J. Gliaudys, Esq.
Jane Preece, Esq.

Second District

Paula G. Leftwich
John O. Murrell

Third District

Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq., Chair
Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.

Fourth District

Jean F. Cohen
Maria C. Tortorelli, Esq.

Fifth District

Reginald Brass
Susan Speir, Vice Chair

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Chief Information Office

Jon W. Fullinwider

Department of
Children and Family Services
Dr. David Sanders

Department of
Public Social Services
Bryce Yokomizo

Child Support Services
Department
Philip Browning

Los Angeles Superior Court
David Jetton

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

California Department of
Child Support Services
Mary Lawrence

Franchise Tax Board
Debbie Strong

CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES MAY 25, 2006

Present

2nd District, John Murrell
3rd District, Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq.
3rd District, Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.
4th District, Maria Tortorelli, Esq.
5th District, Reginald Brass
5th District, Susan Speir
Chief Information Office,
Jim Hall
Child Support Services,
Lori Cruz
Public Social Services,
Sylvia Valencia
Superior Court,
David Jetton
CA Department of Child Support
Services, Mary Lawrence

Guests

Lorraine Cain	CSSD
Dean DeGruccio	CHIEF, CALL CENTER, CSSD
Lisa Garrett	CSSD
Larina Jones	CSSD
Gail Juiliano	CHIEF, QAPI, CSSD
James Maher	CSSD
Shamara McFarland	CSSD
Pati Tellechea	CSSD

Dawn Oliver

Public Comment

Staff

Gabe Alexander	Board of Supervisors
Tim McTighe	Board of Supervisors

Absent

1st District, George J. Gliaudys, Esq.
1st District, Jane Preece, Esq.
2nd District, Paula Leftwich
4th District, Jean Cohen

Children and Family Services,
Sue Harper
Franchise Tax Board,
Debbie Strong

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Eisenberg called the meeting to order as a Committee of the Whole at 9:42 a.m. in the Dan River Room of the Child Support Services Department in Commerce.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT — To include: Review of LAO's Report on Improving Child Support Collections; SDU implementation update, legislative proposals to increase child support funding, budget (Governor's May Revise), allocation workgroup update, etc...

Ms. Lori Cruz reported that:

- Director Philip Browning and Steven Golightly are attending meetings in Sacramento.
- The LAO report addresses the progress made by the child support system since the restructuring in 1999–2000. Child support has made a substantial shift from a prosecutorial agency to a social service agency. The report found that progress was less than that hoped for by the enactment of the legislation. Three factors were listed as contributing to the lack of progress:
 - 1) too much control at the state level, which prevented local agencies from having the flexibility needed to manage the program according to community needs;
 - 2) the lack of fiscal incentive for counties to become invested in the program;
 - 3) lack of funding.The report recommended that DCSS create performance-based programs run by the counties according to their needs, and that counties share in the costs of the program.

Chair Eisenberg inquired as to how the money collected was then distributed, and for clarification of the loan program recommended in the report. Ms. Cruz explained that a portion goes to state and federal government, but a small percentage is returned to the County. While the LAO's report is vague on the percentage of costs counties should assume, it emphasizes the need for cost sharing by local governments. The loan program is intended to address funding inequities that have occurred in the last few years.

Vice Chair Speir asked about the report's comments on the State's denial of Los Angeles County's request to shift the use of resources while on a corrective action enforcement program, noting that the Current Support Improvement Program (CSI) had occurred and that there had been a shift of resources. Ms. Cruz replied that the CSI program was implemented, but not at the level the Department had requested, particularly from the Call Center. Vice Chair Speir stated that the recommendation for a State takeover of a County program in violation of a corrective action program was a good one, but that enforcement provisions must be included in such legislation. Ms. Cruz agreed that proposed

legislation needs specific directions for allocation of resources for enforcement.

- The transition of Los Angeles County to SDU has proceeded smoothly. Collections are very close to last year overall and the error rate is also very low. The suspense rate has remained the same at only 1.2%. SDU has been extremely responsive in correcting errors and in getting special checks out, usually within 24 hours.

Chair Eisenberg inquired if CSSD staff were still assigned to work in Sacramento. Ms. Cruz replied that a handful of CSSD staff would probably remain in Sacramento until full implementation of the State-wide System is achieved. Lisa Garrett noted that some CSSD staff here frequently travel to Sacramento to work with the State on an as needed basis. Chair Eisenberg asked when federal certification might be granted. Mary Lawrence replied that federal evaluation is scheduled to begin in September, but the timetable for the evaluation process has not been determined.

- When the SDU goes state-wide on July 1, use of the lockboxes will cease. Efforts to avoid confusion with near-matches and cases in other counties are ongoing. Some recipients may receive lower amounts, at least initially.

Members Tortorelli and Brass arrived at the meeting, constituting a quorum.

Dean DeGruccio reported that:

- Call Center volume has not increased due to the seamless transition to the SDU. Calls related to the SDU number about 200 per week, which is far less than expected. Wait times for calls are up, however, but new personnel coming on-line should solve this problem.

Vice Chair Speir inquired about redirection of calls when employers start paying directly to the State on August 1. Ms. Cruz stated that the Department will monitor the situation and will be prepared to increase customer service resources, and will keep the lock boxes open for the time being. She also pointed to the effort to inform employers of the change, and that the State and service provider have been making appearances and meeting with employers. Lisa Garrett noted that the State is having a meeting with the City of Long Beach as a result of Vice Chair Speir's inquiry at the April meeting. Vice Chair Speir expressed concern that employers have not had adequate notice to retool their checks with the additional information required. Mary Lawrence noted that the State is aware of the potential problems, and pointed out that the initial emphasis for the State has been on reaching larger employers, and encouraged the Board to inform DCSS of employers that may have been omitted.

Laura Choate of the Compromise of Arrears Program (COAP) and Linda Sekany joined the meeting via teleconference.

Member Brass inquired about the turnaround time for redirection of checks received by CSSD to the State. Ms. Cruz replied that cash payments are deposited in a Los Angeles account and electronic transfer to the State usually occurs within hours. Checks received continue to be flown daily to Sacramento for processing. Member Tortorelli stated that the State is planning to train family law judges on June 14, and that she will be passing on the information to the local Bar Associations. Chair Eisenberg asked about procedures to address issues relating to date of receipt and to avoid placing a parent in arrears. Mary Lawrence answered that the State was employing several mitigating measures, including delaying reporting of arrears. Vice Chair Speir noted that information letters to employers do not indicate that employers must put the name of the source county on checks sent to the State, and Mary Lawrence stated she would investigate.

Ms. Cruz further reported that:

- The legislature is considering bills to provide additional funding to the counties. A measure providing \$4 million plus federal matching funds has passed out of committee. Reimbursement from the counties for funds targeted at additional welfare collections is also being considered.
- The Governor's May Revise does not indicate any changes in child support funding, which remain constant at last year's levels, although CalWorks and MediCal funding have been revised.
- CSSD is holding a Town Hall meeting for CSSD employees at Adventure Park in Whittier on June 1. Director Browning will attend and answer questions. On June 8, an employer workshop will be held at the Arboretum, and will focus on the SDU and redirection
- The State is looking at a new audit tool which is being tested in San Diego County, and is currently scheduled to be implemented in Los Angeles County by the end of summer.
- Mr. Browning continues to meet monthly with the allocation workgroup. Mary Lawrence stated that several proposals have been made for reallocation of existing funding and are now under review.

Ms. Cruz provided copies of a press release regarding transition to SDU, a CCSAS Project Update from the State website, and information regarding the availability of credit card/Western Union payment methods. Only cash payments can be accepted at division sites. Member Kamenir-Resnik suggested that credit card companies might have an interest in promotion of the service.

DCSS REPORT — To include: Compromise of Arrears Program (Laura Choate); summary of procedures to handle problems with obtaining insurance cards (Mary Lawrence); new policies adopted by the Department (Mary Lawrence)

Mary Lawrence introduced Linda Sekany, Branch Manager for the Quality Assurance and COAP, and Laura Choate, Manager and Specialist for COAP.

Ms. Lawrence reported that:

- DCSS began the COAP “reduced minimum” pilot program on May 2. This program addresses arrears amounts from \$501 to \$4,999. Approximately 37% of arrears only cases fit into this category. 26% if the cases are between \$1,000 and \$4,999. Participants in the six month program include the Central Sierra Region (Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras counties), and Orange, Sacramento, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Sonoma counties. The program enables a parent with arrears to reduce that amount through compromise.

Chair Eisenberg inquired if a full lump sum payment of the negotiated amount was required. Laura Choate replied that a lump sum payment was required. Member Kamenir-Resnik asked Ms. Choate to explain the workings of the process. Ms. Choate explained that an NCP goes through the same COAP process used for larger amounts, and that the CPs have the final decision to accept the compromise as to their arrears. The CP has the option not to participate in the program, and maintain all rights as before the negotiation. Vice Chair Speir pointed out that this process allows an NCP to negotiate with a county regarding welfare arrears, but that there is no impact on the CP at all.

Vice Chair Speir inquired about difficulties encountered by use of different forms by the counties, and whether a standard state form would be introduced. Ms. Lawrence replied that the COAP team is providing technical assistance to the various counties to develop consistency and improve collections. While the State does have essential requirements for the forms, counties have been free to modify them to suit their personnel and needs. COAP is working with Los Angeles County to develop consistency throughout the divisions. Ms. Choate explained that standardized COAP forms are available to local child support agencies from the secure COAP website, but because many forms have been revised, COAP is providing technical assistance to insure usage of the current version. COAP has recently released a standardized attachment to the I & E declaration and is aggressively pursuing its exclusive use. Ms. Cruz added that Los Angeles County has started implementation of the new standardized attachment.

Member Tortorelli asked why the standardized forms were only available from the secure website. Ms. Choate explained that the State leaves it to local child support agencies make their own determination regarding outreach methods. Member Tortorelli pointed out that the County lacked the resources to send these forms to persons living out of state. Ms. Garrett stated that CSSD will make the forms available on their website.

Chair Eisenberg inquired regarding specific goals set for COAP. Ms. Choate stated that the program is going through a learning process regarding the effectiveness of outreach methods and responses and that no specific target

has been set. Vice Chair Speir requested a copy of the most current COAP forms packet to use in training of Legal Aid in Long Beach. Ms. Garrett offered to send a representative to aid in the training.

Ms. Lawrence addressed the issue of problems obtaining insurance cards.

- A handout entitled "Health Coverage Oversight Matrix" illustrated the oversight agencies involved, what types of plans would be applicable, and the processes required should an NCP or CP decides to file a complaint.

Chair Eisenberg asked about training for insurance providers regarding their obligations to provide insurance cards. Ms. Lawrence responded that training had been performed by the Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC) to line agents but not to insurers themselves. Chair Eisenberg stated that a written guide for insurers might be very useful. Ms. Lawrence stated that such a guide would come from DMHC or the Department of Insurance, and that DCSS could only suggest a course of action. DCSS is adding information to its website to aid recipients in obtaining insurance cards. Ms. Lawrence agreed to provide a follow-up report on progress in six months.

Member Tortorelli pointed out that many CPs are having difficulty getting off of MediCal and onto the Healthy Families program due to bureaucratic glitches and the lack of coordination between interested parties. Member Kamenir-Resnik stated that similar issues were being encountered by persons going to Legal Aid services. Chair Eisenberg asked if CSSD has looked into ways to get families off of Medi-Cal and onto insurance. Ms. Cruz said there had been no such effort to date. She agreed to report on the possibility of such an effort in October. Member Kamenir-Resnik asked that a dialog with Legal Aid be initiated to see if there were common issues and objectives.

Vice Chair Speir suggested that the State place an article in the Department of Insurance, DHMC, and other agency newsletters explaining the rights of custodial parents with regard to insurance cards. Ms. Lawrence agreed to pursue the suggestion.

Ms. Lawrence then reported on new policies of DCSS. Copies of an information sheet on the DCSS website along with four policy letters were provided.

- Ms. Lawrence encouraged the Members to contact her regarding any information requests or questions on new policies. Four new policy letters with relevance for CSSD and the Board have been issued by DCSS from April, 2006 through May 22, 2006. These letters are published on the public website: www.childsup.cahwnet.gov/library.asp.
- Policy letter **CSS-06-15** "*Review and Adjustment of Child Support Orders for Military Service Members Deployed Out-of-State*". This letter disseminates information about a new review & adjustment process

available to members of the National Guard & military reservists who are deployed out of state. The new process has been developed in accordance with provision of SB1082, Chapter 154, Statutes of 2005, signed by the Governor on August 30, 2005.

The new legislation mandates:

- A new DCSS form & review & modification process of IV-D cases.
 - A new Judicial Council form & review & modification for Non-IV-D Cases.
 - A New Compromise of Arrears program for Service members deployed out of state who fail to request a modification of their child support order prior to deployment. (Details of the new Compromise program will be issued in a separate Child Support Service (CSS) letter.
- Policy letter **CSS-06-14** *“Notice of Support Judgment and Release of Judgment Lien Forms”*: This letter is to inform local child support agencies (LCSAs) of the changes to the requirements for recording and releasing real property liens. AB3032, Chapter 927, Statutes of 2002, amended the Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) & Family Code to permit LCSAs to create a judgment lien on real property by recording a Notice of Support Judgment.
 - Policy letter **CSS-06-13** *“Verification of Unreimbursed Assistance Pools”*: The purpose of this letter is to instruct LCSAs on the policy and procedures for maintaining unreimbursed assistance pools (UAP) calculations during implementation of the California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS), Child Support Enforcement (CSE) Version 1 (V1). Additionally, this letter advises LCSAs of the need to prepare to transfer verifiable UAP balances to the State once CSE Version 2 (V2) is implemented.
 - Policy Letter **CSS-06-12** *“Selective Case Initiation: Establishing a Child Support Case Against One Noncustodial Parent & Not the Other”*. This letter provides clarification to LCSAs regarding selective case initiation when establishing a child support case.

Chair Eisenberg reported on her efforts to obtain a definitive policy from the State on the date a case should open following a referral from Welfare (i.e., the date of initial contact or the date the application is approved). A policy letter is expected be issued within four to six weeks, and a follow-up call to update the Chair is expected in three weeks.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Dawn Oliver addressed the Board. Ms. Oliver explained that she sought medical coverage only for her four month old daughter, and that the father of this child is providing support. She stated that she chose not to have support

pressed onto the father, but that the agency went ahead and proceeded to press support on him. Ms. Oliver also has a thirteen year old from a different father who receives welfare support, and she was told that the only way to stop the new support order was to close the account of the thirteen year old. The reason given was that the agency wanted to insure that the newborn would not benefit from funds given to the thirteen year old.

Member Tortorelli noted that similar reports have been heard in the Family Law Facilitator's Office. Sylvia Valencia of DPSS explained that unless an exception applies, a MediCal application triggers the referral regardless of the intent of the applying spouse. Other agencies then make their own choice whether to pursue the claim.

Lorraine Cain agreed to take Ms. Oliver's information and follow up on the case.

APPROVE MINUTES OF APRIL 27, 2006

A quorum now being present, on motion of Member Kamenir-Resnik, seconded by Vice Chair Speir, and carried unanimously, the minutes for April 27, 2006 were approved.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Chair Eisenberg noted that arrears collections have not improved significantly with the implementation of COAP and asked about efforts toward improvement. Ms. Cruz stated that current arrears collections were close to the goal of 50%, and followed historical trends. Gail Juiliano reported that while the focus is on current support cases, there has been a small increase in arrears collections. Lists of arrears only cases have been created to determine if: 1) a case qualifies for closure; or 2) the case qualifies for some manner of wage assignment such as an employer or qualification for Social Security benefits. About 1,000 of 30,000 cases on the list have been reviewed to date. Ms. Juiliano agreed to report on the progress in July.

Member Tortorelli asked if the same process was being used for collections as in other cases. Ms. Juiliano replied that the same process was being utilized, and that about 20% of the cases investigated so far have resulted in either closure or wage assignments.

Chair Eisenberg stressed that the primary focus of the Board should be to set benchmarks that enable the Board to evaluate the progress of CSSD in specific areas. Chair Eisenberg is working with Ms. Juiliano to organize statistics and develop benchmarks, and hopes to present the results at the next meeting.

REPORT ON SDU TRANSITION AND PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED TO DATE

The Board agreed that this topic had been sufficiently covered in the Director's Report.

RESULTS OF OUTBOUND CALLING PROJECT — DEAN DEGRUCCIO

Dean DeGruccio reported that:

- An outbound call is an automated message generated to reach case participants. Two campaigns were begun in October to remind participants of: 1) civil court dates; and 2) genetic test dates. About 1800 calls per month were sent regarding civil court dates and about 200 calls per month were sent regarding genetic test dates.
- A new campaign will contact NCPs who have stopped paying and offer them assistance. This campaign is now scheduled to begin in July.
- Several other campaigns will follow. The first will contact those persons who have received summons and complaints and invite them to contact the CSSD. The next campaign will contact CPs where the NCP has stopped paying and request information on the NCP. These campaigns should be implemented by the end of the year.
- Mr. DeGruccio invited input on possible future campaigns. He noted that one idea under consideration would contact NCPs who have entered into an agreement and have stopped paying in order to notify them of pending suspension of licenses.

Member Tortorelli inquired if there were any plans to contact employers and coordinate those calls with wage assignments. Mr. DeGruccio stated that such a plan is under consideration, but because it is complicated and would result in duplication of some functions, it would not be implemented in the short term.

Chair Eisenberg asked about methods to measure effectiveness of the calls. Mr. DeGruccio explained that 85% of calls get through to the intended party. Chair Eisenberg suggested that criteria be developed to measure financial benefits incurred from the call projects, and Vice Chair Speir suggested that a sampling could be taken of those appearing at court dates and genetic testing centers to determine the effectiveness of those campaigns.

Chair Eisenberg emphasized the Board's interest in having methods to measure a program's effectiveness, and suggested placing this issue on the November agenda. Mr. DeGruccio pointed out that the NCP campaign should yield measurable results, and that a survey at Central Civil West regarding effectiveness of the court date calling project would be completed by November. Member Kamenir-Resnik cautioned against over-use of the calling system that could result in a loss of goodwill.

DISCUSSION WITH COURT RE: CIVIL CONTEMPT — LORI CRUZ

Ms. Cruz reported that:

- Commissioners for the CCW Court are supportive of the use of civil contempt actions in child support cases. Training has been given to attorneys in each division to review cases and file the civil contempt action. The target date for start of reviewing and filing is June 1.
- Personal service is required in order to obtain jurisdiction over the person against whom enforcement is sought.
- Target numbers for filings have been set for each division, but the goals may not be reached initially because the procedure is new for most of the attorneys.
- Effectiveness of the contempt filings will be assessed. The pilot program was effective since NCPs began paying prior to the contempt hearing.

Ms. Cruz agreed to report on the initial effectiveness in three months. Ms. Juiliano pointed out that it would also be beneficial to review the program in six months to determine if NCPs continue to pay.

FOSTER CARE CASES: report on non-referral of foster care cases and when child support order should be stopped — GAIL JULIANO

Ms. Juiliano provided the Board with copies of the new policy release from DCFS on foster care procedures. Ms. Juiliano reported that:

- Beginning in February, 2006, a determination will be made by DCFS on whether it is in the child's best interest to make a referral to CSSD. If the agency determines that child support collection is inappropriate for the family, no referral will be made.
- Additionally, DCFS will evaluate existing cases annually to determine if ongoing child support enforcement is appropriate. A DCFS case worker will advise CSSD to stop current collection enforcement.
- Because foster care cases involve both parents, a determination whether to stop collection enforcement must be made individually for each parent.
- A sample of 20 cases sent by CSSD to DCFS resulted in a stoppage rate of 50%. Ms. Juiliano expressed hope that this number could go higher once DCFS refines its procedures.

Member Tortorelli inquired if separate data was kept for foster care compromise cases. Ms. Cruz replied that data was kept separate and that the success rate was higher in compromise cases. Vice Chair Speir suggested that a non-referral be included when the CP is a minor, and that a case not be opened when a relative/caretaker who is not receiving aid does not request a case be opened. Ms. Juiliano agreed to get responses from DCFS on these issues.

Vice Chair Speir then asked about a mechanism to stop a child support order

when a change in status such as adoption or reunification occurs or when the case has been opened in error. Ms. Juiliano noted that electronic notification is now sent when reunification occurs, and would bring the other concerns to the attention of the upcoming conference. The annual review by DCFS should also help find cases that should be stopped or closed. Vice Chair Speir pointed out that cases that have previously been closed would not be corrected. Ms. Cruz and Ms. Juiliano agreed that limited resources made review of such cases difficult, but that cases could be dealt with on a case by case basis when called to the department's attention. Members Kamenir-Resnik and Murrell suggested that the department not invest resources unless a known problem exists. Ms. Juiliano agreed to report back to the Board in August, and expressed the view that the yearly review by DCFS will address many of these problem cases.

REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON KARY POUNDERS CASE — JAMES MAHER

James Maher reported that:

- Mr. Ponders had addressed the Board at the April meeting and expressed his frustration with the court system and CSSD's handling of his case. CSSD opened its case on September 21, 2005. The only order then in existence was the original stipulation of the parties filed on July 25, 2001 which provided for payment by Mr. Ponders of \$2,000 per month.
- Subsequent to the opening of the case by CSSD, a new stipulation was filed in which the parties modified the monthly payment to \$1,200 per month.
- The information has now been updated, payments sorted out, and Mr. Ponders has been given an additional credit of \$4,000. However, Mr. Ponders was still found to be in arrears for the \$2,000 August, 2005 payment and \$500 owed for September, 2005. Mr. Ponders states that these amounts were forgiven, but the CP disagrees. The only remedy now available to Mr. Ponders is an appeal to the Court.

Vice Chair Speir inquired about the issue of lack of notice to the NCP of a pending audit. Mr. Maher replied that a review of the procedure by the Customer Service Subcommittee is underway. Ms. Juiliano added that the three county consortium agreed that both the CP and NCP should be asked for an arrears statement, effectively giving notice to the NCP. The exact procedure will be determined.

Member Kamenir-Resnik expressed the view that the facts of the case were not within the jurisdiction of the Board, and the Board should stick to policy matters such as the Due Process issue regarding the lack of notice to the NCP. Chair Eisenberg pointed out that the Board is required to permit public comment. Member Murrell asked what level of review is required of public comment. He further stated that this Board goes into greater detail on case specific issues

than other boards, and not all members need so much detail. Vice Chair Speir pointed out that the factual details of individual cases lead to systemic issues. Member Kamenir-Resnik expressed the view that the level of factual review is intimidating to CSSD staff. Chair Eisenberg suggested that if public comment comes from a client of an advocate on the Board, a report back to that member could be made, and then to the entire Board if resolution is unsatisfactory. Ms. Garrett agreed and stated that the policy of CSSD was to follow that procedure, and that the Board should be primarily focused on policy issues. Member Kamenir-Resnik pointed out that all agree the Pounders case raised a significant issue, but that a short summary of findings would be sufficient to provide the Board with the opportunity to deal with policy issues. She also expressed concern that too much detail would allow the Board to lobbied for specific case results. Mr. Murrell commented that the roles of advocacy and policy advice seemed to often be intermingled.

REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON VINCENT LOGAN CASE — LORI CRUZ

Ms. Cruz reported that:

- Three issues were identified in Mr. Logan's case: 1) the issue of credit reporting; 2) the application of his derivative Social Security benefits; and 3) his billing statement.
- There was a mistake made with credit reporting that has since been corrected. The application of Social Security benefits issue required court action but has also been resolved. The billing statement issue is still being researched by ARS.
- No policy implications or violations have been raised by this case, other than the incorrect credit reporting.

Vice Chair Speir stated that there was an issue of lack of timeliness by CSSD in performing an audit. Member Kamenir-Resnik stated that this was not a policy issue, but merely an error. Vice Chair Speir replied that the case did raise a policy issue of how CSSD handles a reduction from the current payment amount to the child, and agreed to write a memo to Ms. Cruz setting forth the policy question.

CUSTOMER SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT — MARIA TORTORELLI

No report was given at this time.

REVIEW WRITTEN PROCEDURE RE: INQUIRIES ON HEALTH INSURANCE — LORRAINE CAIN

Ms. Cain reported that:

- Written procedures at call centers are now in place for handling inquiries

from CPs regarding insurers' refusal to provide insurance cards.

- The call center now has a dedicated phone number which the CP can call for problems related to insurance cards. The child support representative will follow up with the insurer and then call the CP back within three days. The same representative will continue to follow up until the cards are received by the CP.
- Requests for help with insurance cards will be monitored for frequency and quality, and Ms. Cain will report back to the Board in August.

MATTERS NOT ON THE POSTED AGENDA (TO BE PRESENTED AND PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA)

Mr. Jim Hall of the Chief Information Office noted the amount of background material that was being mailed to members and brought to meetings for disbursement, and inquired if a webpage added to the County site would help members obtain information more efficiently. The members agreed this would be beneficial.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m.